

a user to function within the constraints of an operating system which limits a manner in which data may be stored in a filing system and a manner in which categorization may be performed." (Column 3, lines 20-24.) As Lisle et al. makes abundantly clear, the filing system of the Windows '95 operating system would limit the manner in which data may be stored and categorized so as to be incompatible with Lisle et al.

The Claims Distinguished

Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As can be appreciated from the summaries provided above, the present invention is significantly different from Windows95 in view of Lisle et al.

However, as noted in the Office Action, some of the elements of Claim 1 already exist in Windows95. For example, Windows95 does have a desktop such as the screen element, Windows95 is an operating system, and Windows95 does have file operation dialog boxes. These file operation dialog boxes are even accessible by registered and unregistered programs. However, unlike Windows95, and what was not pointed out in Lisle et al. or the Office Action, is that Claim 1 claims "file operation dialog boxes . . . which are defined . . . to specify a file container associated with the predetermined file-container icon as a default document container." As Windows95 does not teach a default document container, nor for that matter file operation dialog boxes that are defined to specify a default document container, Windows95 fails to teach this element of Claim 1. Additionally, while the Lisle et al. reference does teach collecting representations of documents into its "drawers," these drawers are not for the files related to the application programs; rather, they are just representations of those files that are used to access the files through an interface over the filing system of the operating system. Accordingly, it need hardly be noted that when the operating system-provided file operation dialog boxes of Claim 1 are used, neither Windows95 nor Lisle et al. teaches or suggests having the file operation dialog boxes specify a default document container for files related to one or more application programs. As neither Windows95 nor Lisle et al. teaches a default document container or specifying such a default document container on file operation dialog boxes, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to Claim 1, as it is already in condition for allowance.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{LLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.482.8100

Claims 2-5

Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1 and are allowable for all the reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 1. Additionally, Claims 2-5 contain additional elements which differentiate them from Claim 1. For example, Claim 2 provides a destination menu item associated with a file to permit the file to be moved or copied to the default document container of Claim 1. The file sending feature of the destination menu item of Claim 2 is described in greater detail in the specification on page 13, lines 27-30, and shown in FIGURE 4E of the present application. Applicants have been unable to find any reference within Windows95 or in Lisle et al. which teaches or suggests a "Send To My Documents" feature. As the dependent claims of Claim 1, Claims 2-5 contain such additional features; it is therefore asserted that Claims 2-5 are allowable for these reasons as well.

Claim 6

Claim 6 in many respects is similar to Claim 1 and is allowable for all the reasons above with regard to Claim 1. Additionally, Claim 6 makes it abundantly clear that the default file-storage container is defined by the operating system as the default file-storage container on file operation dialog windows. As neither Windows95 nor Lisle et al. teaches a default file-storage container or, for that matter, a default file-storage container that is presented as such on file operation dialog windows, Claim 6 is allowable for these reasons as well.

Claims 7-11

As Claims 7-11 depend from Claim 6, they are allowable for all the reasons noted above with regard to Claims 6 and 1. Additionally, these claims contain elements further differentiating them from the cited references. For example, Claim 7 provides for a master file that contains information regarding a physical storage device for the default file-storage container and its physical storage device. While Windows95 may contain a master file that contains global information about the operating system and physical devices used by the operating system, Windows95 does not contain a master file containing global information regarding a physical storage device of the default file-storage container. This is apparent as Windows95 does not teach a default file-storage container. In another example from Claim 9, while Windows95 may teach that a master file is accessible over a network by a network

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS
1400 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.5100

administrator, as Windows95 does not teach a default file-storage container, it need hardly be noted that Windows95 does not teach changing the information regarding the physical storage device of the default file-storage container. Accordingly, as neither Lisle et al. nor Windows95 teaches these additional elements, Claims 7-11 are allowable for at least these reasons as well. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to Claims 7-11.

Claims 12 and 25

Independent Claims 12 and 25 are similar and, accordingly, are discussed together. As noted above, Windows95 does teach an operating system that may have one or more registered or unregistered applications. However, there is no teaching in Windows95 of the steps discussed in Claims 12 and 25. In particular, their three "determining" steps are disclosed nowhere in Windows95 or Lisle et al. Still further, the step of "setting a default folder for storing files related to the one application" is nowhere taught or suggested in either Windows95 or Lisle et al. Accordingly, as none of the cited references teaches or suggests the majority of the elements of Claims 12 and 25, these claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 13 and 14

Claims 13 and 14 are sufficiently similar that they are also discussed together. Again, as the operating system of Windows 95 does provide file operation dialog boxes that are accessible by a plurality of registered or unregistered application programs, neither Lisle et al. nor Windows95 teaches providing "a predetermined file storage folder as a default folder on file operation dialog boxes." As none of the cited references teaches file operation dialog boxes that have been provided with a default folder, it need hardly be noted that neither Windows95 nor Lisle et al. renders Claims 13 or 14 obvious. Therefore, Claims 13 and 14 should be considered as being in condition for allowance.

Claim 15

Claim 15 is allowable for similar reasons as the independent claims discussed above. As Claim 15 teaches an operating system comprising one or more file-management modules that are defined to provide a default file-storage folder, it is again apparent that neither Windows95 nor Lisle et al. teaches providing a default file-storage folder, let alone providing one or more file-

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS
1470 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

management modules that are defined to provide such a default file-storage folder. Accordingly, as none of the cited references teaches or suggests the element of a default file-storage folder or providing such a default file-storage folder to file-management modules, Claim 15 is also in condition for allowance.

Claim 21

Claim 21 provides for an operating system with a graphical user interface that includes a desktop that provides access to a predetermined file storage container, and further includes file-operations windows wherein each file-operations window includes a link to the desktop. Neither Windows95 nor Lisle et al. teaches file-operations windows that include a link to the desktop. Still further, Windows95 and Lisle et al. fail to teach or suggest file operation windows that include a link to a desktop wherein the desktop provides access to a predetermined file-storage container. Accordingly, Claim 25 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 27

Claim 27 provides for an operating system providing a default document folder for use by registered or unregistered application programs before the installation of the application programs on a computer system. Neither Windows95 nor Lisle et al. teaches or suggests providing for a default document folder before the installation of application programs on a computer system. Claim 27 also provides for displaying an icon associated with a default document folder during a file operation relating to one or more of the application programs. Again, Windows95 and Lisle et al. fail to teach a default document folder and also fail to teach displaying an icon associated with a default document folder during a file operation related to one or more of the application programs. Accordingly, as none of the cited references anticipates or renders obvious Claim 27, Claim 27 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 19, 20, and 28

Claims 19 and 28 are similar and are discussed together. Claim 19 provides for a graphical user interface that includes a most-recently-used file menu that displays links to one or more most-recently-used files and to one or more document folders. While Windows95 does teach a most-recently-used documents list, it does not teach that such a list contains a link to any folders, let alone to one or more document folders. As the most-recently-used list of Windows95

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100